

## REMARKS

Claims 1-46 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-46 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 10, 21, 25, and 36 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1-46 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-18, 20-23, and 29-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereafter Martinez), in view of Buxton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,115,025 (hereafter Buxton), and in view of Armitage et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082 (hereafter Armitage). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

An electronic system capable of being rotated with respect to a line of sight of a user and further having a first display mode, a second display mode, and a third display mode, said electronic system comprising:

a processor coupled to a bus;

a memory device coupled to said bus;

a communication port coupled to said bus, wherein each display mode depends on a position of said communication port relative to said line of sight of said user, wherein said position facilitates communication with a second electronic system via said communication port;

one or more display mode controls for selectively operating said electronic system in one of said first, said second, and said third display modes, wherein a first display orientation corresponds to said first display mode, a second display orientation corresponds to said second display mode, and a third display orientation corresponds to said third display mode; and

an electronic display device coupled to said bus, wherein said electronic display device is configured for displaying visual data in a display orientation corresponding to a selected display mode of said electronic system, wherein each display orientation compensates for rotation of said electronic system, and wherein said rotation with respect to said line of sight occurs such that said rotation avoids crossing a plane on which said electronic system rests, further wherein said communication port

is configured ***to transmit said selected display mode to said second electronic system to enable appropriate display orientation configuration of said second electronic system with respect to said electronic system.*** (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "said communication port is configured ***to transmit said selected display mode to said second electronic system to enable appropriate display orientation configuration of said second electronic system with respect to said electronic system***" (emphasis added). Although the Final Office Action at page 8 states that Armitage discloses, "transmitting the display mode configuration to a second system and configuring said second system" at Col. 7 lines 3-15, the citation Col. 7 lines 3-15 of Armitage simply discloses that the tablet computer system 300 can operate as a stand-alone computer system or can communicate with a base unit (see Figure 4) to access a communication network so that it can access other computers and peripherals. Thus, Armitage as well as Martinez and Buxton fail to disclose transmitting the selected display mode to the second electronic system to enable appropriate display orientation configuration of the second electronic system with respect to the electronic system, as recited in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-9 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-9 are patentable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, the Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 recite transmitting the selected display mode to the second electronic system to enable appropriate display orientation configuration of the second electronic system. Therefore, Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 are allowable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 11-18 and 20, Dependent Claims 22-23 and 29-35, and Dependent Claims 37-46 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10, 21, and 36 respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 11-18, 20, 22-23, 29-35, and 37-46 are patentable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 19 and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereafter Martinez), in view of Buxton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,115,025 (hereafter Buxton), in view of Armitage et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082 (hereafter Armitage), and further in view of Kang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,408 (hereafter Kang). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 19 and Dependent Claims 24-28 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10 and 21 respectively, which are allowable over the

combination of Martinez, Buxton, and Armitage. Moreover, Kang does not disclose transmitting the selected display mode to the second electronic system to enable appropriate display orientation configuration of the second electronic system, as recited in Independent Claims 10 and 21. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 10 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, Armitage, and Kang for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 19 and 24-28 are patentable over the combination of Martinez, Buxton, Armitage, and Kang for the reasons discussed above.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-46) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-46) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

4/27/2005



Anthony C. Murabito  
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060